

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Lead Entity and Regional Recovery Organization for Summer Chum Salmon Technical Advisory Group Meeting Attendance List

Island Lake Community Center, July 29, 2009

1. Pete Schroeder - Citizen
2. Cheryl Baumann - North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity
3. Alex Gouley- Skokomish Tribe
4. Doris Small- WA Dept. Fish and Wildlife
5. Vern Rutter- Hood Canal Environmental Council
6. Janet Aubin-Port Gamble S'Klallam tribe
7. Hans Daubenberger- Port Gamble S'Klallam tribe
8. Luke Cherney- Hood Canal Coordinating Council
9. Richard Brocksmith- Hood Canal Coordinating Council
10. Tom Springer- Citizen
11. Dan Hannafious- Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
12. Heidi Huber- Hood Canal Coordinating Council
13. Audrey Miles Cherney- Hood Canal Coordinating Council
14. Rebecca Benjamin- North Olympic Salmon Coalition
15. Michael L. Blanton- WA Dept. Fish and Wildlife
16. Nicole Hill- Cascade Land Conservancy
17. Byron Rot- Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
18. Sarah Spaeth- Jefferson Land Trust
19. Nancy Newman- Jefferson Land Trust
20. Peter Bahls- Northwest Watershed Institute
21. Fayette Krause-Northwest Watershed Institute
22. Carrie Cook-Tabor- US Fish and Wildlife

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Lead Entity and Regional Recovery Organization for Summer Chum Salmon Draft Technical Advisory Group Meeting Notes

Island Lake Community Center, July 29, 2009

Introductions were conducted. This meeting is the TAG ranking meeting, but is conducted as a joint exercise with some members of the citizen's committee (Habitat Project List Committee) to improve communication and understanding. Agenda was reviewed and agreed to by consensus. The TAG discussed ground rules and conflict of interest guidelines documented in the HCCC 2009 Process Guide.

The committees reviewed available funding for 2009 Grant Round:

- Total= **\$5,659,652** minus **\$2,591,334** already allocated for Skokomish Estuary Island Restoration Phase 2 and Little Quilcene Delta Cone Removal.
- Remainder to allocate in 2009-11= **\$3,068,318**, though additional funds may be available to allocate later.

The process for independent scoring was reviewed. Ten individuals independently evaluated and scored proposed projects, with several reviewers skipping projects with a perceived conflict of interest. Scores were compiled by Richard Brocksmith, Lead Entity Coordinator for HCCC, and normalized to address scoring bias. The outcome of this compilation is referred to as interim technical scores and produced a draft ranking from which the TAG begun discussions.

Tarboo-Dabob Bay Acquisition and Restoration

The first question raised was the appropriateness of the "pre-scoring" assigned to each proposal to represent its priority/strategic nature and relevance to salmon recovery, which is called the Domain Score. *Peter Bahls* suggested the Tarboo-Dabob Bay Acquisition and Restoration project was underscored at a Domain 4 value of 5 points when it should have been a Domain 2 value of 25 points. The main point in question was related to the strategic nature of various types of nearshore habitats and whether or not the proposal would protect/restore a "significant" habitat versus "non-significant" habitat, as previously defined by the HCCC 2009 Process Guide.

NWI looked at old surveys to show that the proposed lot(s) for protection include salt marsh/mud flat, approximately 85 feet out from property line based on an adjacent property survey. Government meander line is written in the deed (meander line is govt. survey from 1850). Peter also referenced Steve Todd et al. which showed of the 6 largest salt marsh complexes in the study area, Tarboo Dabob Bay area is the only one considered "functional". But what was Steve's defn of "complex", as compared to the HCCC 2009 Process Guide? Dabob Bay is composed of salt marsh, mud flat, coastal drift influence/sand spit, stream delta complex, and so at that scale clearly represented "significant" nearshore habitats. Did the proposal include enough of the larger significant habitats to be considered significant in its own right? Peter also referenced the documented summer chum and Chinook salmon use from his 2004 study.

Byron Rot- Move to change to domain 2, not domain 4

More discussion - Oak bay is domain 2, so why isn't this? How much area makes a salt marsh habitat complex significant? Are we still being strategic at smaller areas? This proposal would protect roughly 0.6 acres of salt marsh at 300 feet by 85 feet.

What restoration will be accomplished? A 300 foot deep lot will be protected as riparian area, junk will be removed, complete riparian restoration, permanently dedicated to protection of shoreline. Only 5 lots left unprotected in that area.

Doris Small – agrees to moving it to Domain 2 given the larger ecosystem context around the proposal, but cautiously as it does have implications for broadening our strategies.

Richard Brocksmith- if we open up this definition to any lot that has some fringing salt marsh we would be opening up much of the shoreline in Hood Canal to a high level of priority. When the committees had this discussion in 2007, Richard's memory was of the group trying to define a size and scale of habitat that was of sizeable enough proportions to be of significant benefit to rearing and migrating salmonids. However, the size and scale criteria are not explicit in the HCCC 2009 Process Guide. Federally and locally-adopted salmon recovery plans do not explicitly support that level of priority, so we need to be conservative until better documentation/science exists. A longer term process is now in place to through the Summer Chum Salmon Recovery Plan Adaptive Management effort to improve specificity of nearshore protection and restoration priorities.

Doris sees Richards point, reaffirms the need to be cautious about this project, but sees it as a part of the Bay's larger complex too.

**Group Consensus* - Change Tarboo-Dabob Bay Acquisition and Restoration Project to 25 points for Domain Score.

Three other projects' Domain Scores were also questioned, including Donovan Creek and the two Knotweed Control Projects.

Donovan Creek Acquisition and Restoration

Some of the work is in Domain 1 and some in Domain 4. Richard had pre-scored an average of scores for these two areas, yielding 20 points ((5 plus 35) divided by 2).

20 vs 35 points. A lot of project is in domain 4 watershed, some in domain 1.

Does have benefits to domain 1 area downstream.

Byron Rot - 2/3 tidal estuary and wetland, plus the project upstream should have watershed process benefits (water quality, shading/temperature, woody debris, etc.), thus suggesting it should be weighted to the larger Domain 1 score of 35 points.

Luke Cherney - 22.5 is a weighted average (60% is domain 1) Is that fair?

Some discussion about ambiguity – goal to put together a list that is putting forward the highest priorities for summer chum. Younger salmon need the productive, protective areas. Donovan is within 1 mi. of both Quilcene Rivers, and is documented as providing juvenile rearing habitat.

Based on earlier discussions, Hans and Doris feel Donovan should be at least equal to Tarboo and Oak Bay (25points), given the project's relative benefits to salmon recovery.

**Group Consensus* - Change Donovan Creek Acquisition and Restoration Project to 25 points for Domain Score.

Knotweed Control

Union Dewatto and Mission Tahuya domain points were averaged in the pre-scoring process. This was agreed upon by group and left as it had been pre-scored.

Break

The group returned from the break to see the new interim technical ranking as a result of adding 20 points to Tarboo proposal and 5 points to Donovan proposal. All independent scores were again normalized to address scoring bias. Clear bins were again apparent from these interim results.

The group began by evaluating projects by bin starting at the top of the interim list. The first 3 projects were quite similar in project scoring and in project type with all of them being proposed acquisitions in the highest priority summer chum and Chinook watersheds. Also, all of them had costs that are uncertain and land owner commitment is relatively uncertain until funding and appraisal values come back.

If project falls through, what happens to funding? Acquisitions should be severable.

Richard responded by saying that we can assign project funding according to relative level of certainty since SRFB funding disappears if project falls through while PSAR funding will get reallocated to projects down the list as prioritized by the groups if project falls through or comes in under budget. Thus each of the top 3 projects would be PSAR funded.

**Group Consensus* - Everyone comfortable with ranking of top 3 projects.

Union Estuary Johnson Farm Dike Design

Richard Brocksmith - handed out citizen comments from email about Johnson Farm Dike design.

Essentially a citizen raised some technical concerns about the level of restoration feasible at the site and raised questions about whether the adjacent landowners supported the project.

Doris Small - supports project but wants to see a blank slate in the designs—don't start with architectural designs as she didn't believe they represented maximum restoration nor even feasible options given constraints of funding used to purchase lands to begin with.

Conditions:

- The TAG suggests that the project sponsor start with a **blank slate** for project design, rather than with the submitted set of design proposals.
- Don't allow project to go to contract until WDFW has a legal review that says that dike breaching is feasible given the current land use and Growth Management Act concerns.

Doris Small (WDFW) volunteered to follow this project, with several suggesting she would be an ideal co-manager of the design project.

Vern Rutter – “Jewel” of a project because of the potential environmental, cultural, and educational value.

Carrie Cook-Tabor – may not benefit salmon as much as we would like because the certainty of success seemed low given the constraints placed on the project by the trail system and setback levee. Carrie

also had thought the project was working from the alternatives provided that showed limited restoration, and thus she scored the project low. If the project starts with a blank slate and works to restore the entire 45 acres up to Roessel RD, she would score the project higher.

Richard Brocksmith – If project comes to contract before we have a legal opinion about feasibility of dike breaching, we will write that condition into contract.

Lilliwaup Reach Assessment and Design

Condition:

- The TAG would like a technical sub-committee to work with the project sponsor in scoping the project further, developing and selecting design alternatives, and assessing long term sustainability of designs.

Skokomish General Investigation

Alex Gouley – In answering a question, Alex stated that this project was in its feasibility and assessment phase to identify ways to reduce flooding impacts and restore habitat, for entire main stem, plus South Fork and North Fork. County and Tribe are sharing the cost/responsibility, with MCD representing the County. The current conditions report is due out this winter, while the requested funds would potentially complete the assessment work for selection of alternatives.

Alex Gouley - Federal appropriation request for 2010 is about \$700K, but MCD only requested \$429K matching given money from 2007 SRFB was still unspent and could be utilized to complete match to federal appropriation. Larry Skutter is the new, dedicated project manager. Current agreements call for Tacoma to fund the general investigation through Cushman settlement in years past 2010.

When would this funding from this round be spent? Could we revisit this project in SRFBD 2010? Gain more confidence, put pressure on Army corps?

Richard Brocksmith - In defense, they need money by September 2010, before next grant cycle. If agreed as a priority among lead entity committees we would need to allocate money this round so we don't slow down the investigation.

Hiring outside consultants may bring project up to speed. Tetra tech will be the outside consultant.

Doris Small – wants to keep the momentum going.

Luke Cherney - Ways to apply pressure, pre-conditions?

Byron Rot- Would the corps be responsive if the money was withheld?

Richard Brocksmith – There is a need for a more defined scope of work, products x,y,z from the Corps and its local partners if we are to have enough confidence to keep supporting this project.

Hans Daubenberger – This request is gut-wrenching because we have seen so little completed to date for all the money spent and it comes at the expense of good projects further down the list. Much is riding on its successful completion, but we won't know what completion will bring for salmon recovery until the end of the process. Many agreed with these sentiments.

Is there anything so technically difficult that the army corps has to do it?

Richard Brocksmith – In answering a question, stated that Corps came in as a neutral 3rd party, their process costs more up front but they bring 50% of federal funds to implement the plans. It should pay off if the GI phase is done well. Hybrid approach with Corps managing an outside consultant may be just the right approach.

Conditions:

- What are the deliverables funded to date, and when can we expect to see them?
- What is the scope of work for these funds?

Summer Chum Riparian East Jefferson

Peter Bahls – If this is just “job security” then it’s not appropriate for SFRB funding, but how else to get funding?

Doris Small – WCC crews are a good efficiency of use for the money.

Hans Daubenberger - 1 year of funding for trees is not enough time to ensure success.

Rebecca Benjamin - if needed we would recruit volunteer labor. Other partners have their own backup plans. This is a pilot project, to find out how efficient this method is. We are testing the coordination and logistics of dealing with 7 watersheds with 7 partners.

Dan Hannafious - single year is a stepping stone to future success.

Condition:

- Important to track the actions undertaken with these funds and their effectiveness – especially as a pilot year. This could be done ideally in the Habitat Work Schedule on-line.

Southern Hood Canal Riparian Enhancement

Two years of funding, rather than one year of funding for the NOSC proposal.

Same points apply as in the East Jefferson Riparian proposal in that successful plantings will require more than one year of maintenance, in most cases. How do we maintain sites in the future?

Condition:

- Important to track the actions undertaken with these funds and their effectiveness – especially as a pilot year. This could be done ideally in the Habitat Work Schedule on-line.

Hama Hama Engineered Log Jams and Off Channel Restoration

Byron Rot - What is the function of the ELJ aspect, bank protection or creating habitat?

Dan Hannafious- Robbins family has a legacy of not having wood in the stream. This is an opportunity to show them some benefits of wood.

Richard Brocksmith- Robbins are having erosion problems, came to HCSEG. The lead entity committees asked HCSEG to change it from just bank protection, to a project that provides more diversity/complexity for habitat. What is the risk of not doing anything? Owners may be able to get permits to expand riprap revetment.

Entire family on board? Yes. It is a family council with various opinions within the group. However, they have signed the landowner acknowledgement form.

Luke Cherney - good balance between making connections with the family to possibly do more with them in the future and creating salmon habitat.

Carrie Cook-Tabor – concerned that the project is more for bank protection and not providing effective fish habitat. She consulted a coworker who evaluates ELJ’s and said the plans did not look effective for habitat.

Would these ELJs provide habitat for fish? How much of a habitat improvement would be made?

Richard Brocksmith – This is not a natural channel. It was dredged through salt marsh and there is no protective refuge. The ELJs will be anchored not pile driven. Culvert to the salt marsh will be removed to improve and expand access for juveniles (currently filled with sediment).

Byron Rot - Better than nothing. Currently there is no wood in this system.

If this area erodes, will owners try to install a dike?

How much excavation?

Carrie - It’s how the ELJs are done: spacing, height, etc. affect fish use.

Richard - Is there a way to improve this design yet still maximize protection?

Byron – stick ELJ further into the flow to get more fish use.

Peter Bahls - What about the danger of having the river move more and threaten land owner property? Can we make a condition that the owners agree to not do bank control?

Land behind jams is already flooded, but what if new design causes significant problems, unintended consequences? Is catastrophic avulsion a concern? These questions need to be well understood by the project engineer.

Byron – Should they bury the upper most log jams in land to minimize erosion potential?

Conditions:

- The TAG would like to see an improved habitat design with increased habitat complexity and root wads sticking further out into flow.
- The TAG also wants to ensure that the project engineer understands the potential for and risks of the river getting behind the upper log jam and avulsing.

Donovan Creek Restoration and Acquisition

Hans Daubenberger - Concern over construction techniques, soil compaction issue? How necessary is the stream meandering aspect of the project?

Byron Rot - project can confine work to the channel that will be excavated, not on wetlands and outlying areas (no trucks compacting etc., limit disturbance in language of construction specifications).

Audrey Miles Cherney - Compaction impacts can be minimized by having excavator loosen/rip soil as it leaves the site as a final action followed up with immediate reseeding and plantings.

Why relocate and remeander stream? Currently the creek is at a higher point of the valley, we want to return channel to low point of the valley so all water is flowing to low point. And to create a meandering channel vs a ditch.

Richard Brocksmith - This may have been better proposed as a design/conservation given lack of design details; we need more details, need more certainty on what can be done with the money to evaluate.

Peter Bahls – recommends to fund acquisition and design this year, remeander to be done later.

Should we take a closer look, pull out certain parts: go ahead with acquisition and design, look further into restoration? - Restoration alone won't rank as high on a future request.

Partners have already submitted a USFWS Coastal Wetlands Grant which won't go through unless there is a guaranteed match, so altering project scope has potential funding implications.

The design is conceptual and not "set in stone". A TAG can help with design.

Doris Small - Are we removing the restoration aspect or assigning a committee to assess/assist with restoration planning?

Rebecca Benjamin – suggests to include a TAG for scoping and development

Doris agrees with Rebecca as does Michael Blanton.

Peter doesn't like SRFB funding being used if technical specifications are not certain to be agreed upon.

Acquisition Cost: \$468,190.00

Use PSAR money so money can trickle down if necessary

If they don't get the Coastal Grant, let's just focus on the acquisition with SRFB/PSAR funding. There are other grants with different ranking criteria for restoration for which this project could qualify, once conservation has been completed.

Conditions:

- The TAG would like a technical sub-committee to work with the project sponsor in scoping the project further, developing and selecting design alternatives, and assessing long term sustainability of designs.
- If Coastal Wetlands grant falls through the SRFB money will be re-scoped for acquisition.

Big Beef Creek Conservation

Luke Cherney - What we get for amount of money isn't great - 10 acres with ~4 acres stream/floodplain/slope and 330 ft of creek for \$333,453 (fee simple acquisition).

Is it really worth that much? Who did the appraisal? Appraisal by third party (in the last year) has been reviewed. [Note that in subsequent discussions with landowner it was learned that the value of the property was assigned by estimate, not by appraisal.]

Vern Rutter – If appraisal was done in June or July of 2008 it's not worth that now.

What value is the habitat? It is part of the Intensively Monitored Watershed Program (IMW). One of the last in-holdings in a significant set of conservation projects completed previously.

Lower Big Beef Creek Design

Director of UW Aquatic and Fishery Sciences has given verbal approval, but is seeking legal review to determine ability to sign landowner acknowledgement form. UW faculty is still considering how to participate in the project, but believe the design study is an appropriate next step.

Bryon Rot – Tribes have sought this project for quite some time.

Doris Small - Role of DFW is significant; Dave Price has been the lead.

Being part of the IMW should make this a higher priority.

North Fork Skokomish Pond Reconnection

Like Hama Hama, important land owner we want to connect with?

Owners are easy to deal with.

Owners are going to modify the ponds regardless, this is our chance to influence their plans.

Luke Cherney - Should we wait for GI results before tackling large projects—why spend money if we don't know if it's the right thing to do yet? - Tribe would lean that way as well if forced to weigh in.

Doris Small -Project had largest standard Deviation in scoring, so there was a lot of disparity on people's view of the project value. This is a potentially valuable project but without a lot of certainty.

Union Dewatto Knotweed Control Phase 2

Knotweed control is important- Can we re-scope projects in order to pick them up with funding?

Consensus on knotweed funding- Yes, it is needed to follow up for previous projects (especially Union-Dewatto). We can't just walk away or we would jeopardize previous funding effectiveness.

Combine with SHC Riparian Enhancement (Mason cons.dist)? There was a recognition of an inability to combine knotweed and riparian projects without decreasing scope of work.

Oak Bay Park Sand Lance Habitat

Byron Rot – The Tribe has concerns about impacts to cultural resources given the current project scope to design excavation. The project is currently infeasible as it would not be given permits for construction.

Several committee members suggested this project was of value to salmon and ecosystem recovery and would like to see it pursued in the future at least at a decreased scope to include revetment removal if cultural resources concerns were able to be addressed first.

Seabeck Culvert Design

This project has merit for continuing to pursue funding, but is in a watershed with a lower Domain Score and thus won't be funded currently though the lead entity. Given the nature of this project and its relevance to the IMW program, we hope it can be proposed to SRFB for programmatic funding, as well as other funding sources.

Proposals to move projects:

1. North Fork Skokomish

Peter Bahls - Motions to move North Fork Skok Pond Reconnection to bottom of list or just recommend no funding.

Richard Brocksmith – That would be a drastic measure to recommend “no funding”.

Can projects just be moved up or down? Yes, especially if additional information is provided.

Doris Small – She doesn’t think it should be at bottom of list.

Richard Brocksmith- Suggests moving it between Tarboo and Oak Bay, effectively down two notches.

2. Lower Big Beef Creek Design - Move up one notch, given relative benefit for salmon

3. Oak Bay - Move to bottom of list, given the proposal does not appear to be feasible at this point.

Seek cultural resource answers, re-scope, and submit it next year.

**Group Consensus* – Move three projects above as stated.

BB Creek Conservation Project Discussion

Carrie Cook-Tabor – ranked it low because low benefit to salmon

Hans Daubenberger – ranked it higher because it’s a remaining hold out to have a completely protected corridor in Lower Big Beef Creek.

Luke Cherney - What is the benefit to salmon compared to other projects? Other projects have much higher value to salmon.

Is a separate proposal possible for a partner with another group or funding agency for the uplands?

Only about 4 acres out of 10 are riparian and thus immediately relevant to salmon recovery.

Preferred Option - to partially fund (40%) project to pay for riparian area, and then get someone else to protect uplands.

Can we do that? – It was determined that we can’t do that without talking to the project sponsor first (who will be at the citizen’s committee meeting—can be addressed then).

4. Union Dewatto Knotweed Control - Timeliness issue given recent investments. Move one notch up.

Certainty of success? Small percentage of people are signed up so far, but it is very early in project.

How feasible is it to get more people on board? What is the certainty of success? Mendy is looking into marketing strategies to reach land owners. Land owners are generally positive (no one has said get off my land).

**There was no group consensus on this proposal to move this project, so a vote was called for.*

**Vote* - Move Union Dewatto Knotweed Control Phase 2 up one notch.

- 6 in favor, 2 disagree, 1 abstain; Motion carries.

Adjourn Meeting, 2:50 pm.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Lead Entity and Regional Recovery Organization for Summer Chum Salmon Habitat Project List Committee Meeting Attendance List

Island Lake Community Center, July 29, 2009

1. Pete Schroeder- Citizen
2. Cheryl Baumann- North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity
3. Sandra Staples-Bortner - Great Peninsula Conservancy
4. Vern Rutter- Hood Canal Environmental Council
5. Doris Small- WA Dept Fish and Wildlife (TAG)
6. Rich Geiger- Mason Conservation District
7. Rick Endicott-Long Live The Kings
8. Phil Best- Kitsap Citizen
9. Fayette Krause- Northwest Watershed Institute
10. Richard Brocksmith- Hood Canal Coordinating Council
11. Tom Springer- Citizen
12. Neil Werner- Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
13. Sarah Spaeth - Jefferson Land Trust
14. Nancy Newman- Jefferson Land Trust
15. Rebecca Benjamin- North Olympic Salmon Coalition
16. Michael L Blanton- Washington Dept Fish and Wildlife
17. Nicole Hill- Cascade Land Conservancy
18. Richard Wojt- Citizen
19. Mel Coffman- Theler Center, citizen
20. Anne Whitman- Theler Center, citizen
21. John Blankenship – Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
22. Fred Barrett- Pacific Northwest Salmon Center
23. Heidi Huber- Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Lead Entity and Regional Recovery Organization for Summer Chum Salmon Draft Habitat Project List Committee Meeting Notes

Island Lake Community Center, July 29, 2009

Purpose: To review final proposed projects and technically-ranked list, evaluate social and economic merits of the proposals, and determine a final ranked project list to be forwarded to the SRFB.

Introductions were conducted. This meeting is the HPLC ranking meeting, but is conducted as a joint exercise with some members of the technical advisory group to improve communication and understanding. The agenda was reviewed and agreed to by consensus, with one addition to add a second public comment period at 4:30pm.

The HPLC discussed ground rules and conflict of interest guidelines documented in the HCCC 2009 Process Guide. The HPLC also discussed composition of the committee and decision-making. Each past and current project sponsor gets one representative for citizen's committee. In addition, several citizens at large are appointed as leaders in community who are un-aligned and non biased.

Review Results from TAG

How did we get to these rankings? Independent reviews by technical committee. Following TAG discussions, they moved three projects into a different ranked order by consensus and moved a fourth project following a vote (see notes above).

Richard explained PSAR vs SRFB funding flexibility with process of PSAR funds being able to trickle down the list instead of being lost back to a statewide fund (see notes above).

Process Questions and Discussion

An HPLC member asked the question of what is the highest priority according to HCCC 2009 Process Guide; de-listing ESA-listed fish or preventing additional ESA-listings?

Richard answered by suggesting that current policy is to focus on projects that will forward delisting as quickly as possible, but some small percentage of funding has gone for projects in the past in areas with fewer ESA listed fish so that we could continue to engage different communities in salmon recovery.

Vern Rutter and Tom Springer – Proposed to accept the list as forwarded by TAG. After some discussion, there was agreement to fully evaluate the project list before entertaining this proposal. Another proposal was made to look only at the bottom of the list at projects in danger of not being funded.

Rebecca Benjamin - Lets not just skip to the bottom of the list, what is the value of the citizen committee if we don't go through every project using the criteria laid out for the HPLC?

After much discussion, it was decided to look at projects for "red flags" concerning education, funding, or community issues.

Top Three Projects

Question raised about the uncertainty of the amount of \$ needed given the requests were all based on estimated property values.

Response: This will be in the PSAR funding category; unused funds will trickle down after final dollar needs are decided by an approved appraisal process.

Some concerns were expressed about the large relative cost of these three projects and the negative affects further down the list of decreased available funding.

Union Estuary Johnson Farm Dike Design

Tom Springer - This is a high education and community impact priority; could there possibly be a higher priority for educating the public in Hood Canal given the proximity to Theler and Pacific Northwest Salmon Center (PNWSC)?

Richard Brocksmith - Citizen emails handed out and discussed. Some don't want to lose agricultural land and adjacent landowners (school board) don't feel they need to be involved in this discussion.

Mel Coffman (Theler Center) - Loss of trails is their primary concern. Four alternatives were included in the application materials, many of which they felt compromised the trail system.

Neil Werner - Reconfirmed that the proposal states that trails will remain intact and will be moved onto pile supported walkways. A set of alternatives developed by the landscape architect were included in the application materials for in order to provide all available materials, but those were just concepts. Condition language from TAG was discussed to start with a design "blank slate".

Is the technical committee going to follow this project and make the final decision?

Doris Small from WDFW will be working with HCSEG and PNWSC in project implementation for design phase. Since WDFW is the landowner, they will be responsible for final decisions based on legal, biological, and community input developed in this design phase.

Skokomish General Investigation

How much of the past money has been spent?

Rich Geiger - First year of SRFB money has been spent. The second year of SRFB funding has not all been spent yet, which is how they are able to ask for less than the entire federal appropriation match. This request is for new funding for fiscal year 2010. Funding will cover hydrologic and hydraulic analyses, environmental analyses, cultural resource review, socioeconomic evaluation, real estate. This project is being integrated with other work being done in the estuary, North Fork, and Vance Creek. This project is the capstone effort.

Is \$700,00 enough?

Big question: What's going to happen with the federal budget? Received more fed funding than expected this year; congressional guidance has suggested that this will be repeated. Nothing indicates that project cost will go up.

What was the TAG's opinion? Want to see conditions for this project: timeline and deliverables.

Donovan Creek

Discussion and review of conditions.

Hama Hama ELJ and Off-Channel

Recap of TAG discussion and conditions. Also discussed value of continuing to work with landowners.

Lower Big Beef Creek Design

School supports, conducting final legal review.

Tribe and DFW support

There is a hope that a faculty member will take this project under "his/her wing" to maximize opportunity to educate and learn from project.

Knotweed Control Union Dewatto Phase 2

No one has said no. Education is a large part of the project. Keep landowners motivated and informed. Stewardship is a positive outcome. Use HCSEG interns and women from the correction center to maximize education. Currently it is a 1 year proposal. Will we be paying for this forever? Discussed role of the Regional Knotweed Control Strategy.

Goal: To build the program and get over the infestation curve and have noxious weed boards take over. In the future it would be nice to see demonstrated outcomes that landowners are taking care of their own property

Big Beef Creek Conservation

There was a concern expressed that the amount of protection for salmon was relatively expensive. The project sponsor clarified that no appraisal had yet been completed and that the proposal was based on a property value estimate.

There was further discussion around idea of going after just the 4 acres of riparian with salmon funding while finding a more creative solution for the uplands.

Have you discussed an easement? Response from sponsor was yes but the landowner was more interested in a fee simple sale. Owners are providing 15% of final appraised value

Several in attendance expressed that it would be nice to complete the last piece of the puzzle after 15 years of work. Also that this would be a nice project to fund to provide some equity for Kitsap County. The project was not directly moved down earlier today in the TAG meeting, but was indirectly lowered because two other projects were moved above it.

There are other places to acquire funding that may be more appropriate for the uplands.

TAG issue: Cost/acre was very high and a large portion of area is upland

If funded, it should be considered for PSAR Funding

Would willing seller wait on this? Potentially

Before goes to final panel, need to have appraisal? Not necessarily. Will it be red flagged given large percentage of uplands? Unknown.

Riparian areas don't have as much dollar value as upland areas that can be developed.

Is there time to do an appraisal and come back to address these issues?

Upland areas of this scale shouldn't be paid for with salmon funds.

Leave project where it is, let them address concerns, any extra funding would trickle down to this project.

Talk to landowner, move further down the list if price is not reduced?

Tarboo-Dabob Bay

Community has seen a lot of money invested into these areas (Tarboo and Big Beef). These properties are nearing the final pieces of the puzzle. Are we sending the message that we are only taking it to 90%?

Comment: Last pristine place on the canal

Lots of community support, landowner support. The conservation easement the owners are agreeing to gives full protection. And the owners are considering donating adjacent 5 acres in their will.

Citizens that are opposed are concerned about property rights (not opposed to this specific project as far as the sponsor knows)

Peter Bahls briefed that the acquisition includes 300 ft riparian near shore and 85 ft of salt marsh.

We will fail if our only option to protect the shoreline is to purchase land.

Have there been attempts to attain funding from somewhere else? Yes

Skokomish General Investigation

Sandra Staples-Bortner - Skokomish GI is asking for too much, with significant down-list affects on funding.

Rich Geiger - Had conference call with the Corps earlier today. Communicating that we need more accountability, what is money being used for, outcomes? Local community is counting on this program moving forward to restore salmon and decrease flood hazards.

Seabeck Creek Culvert

Pete Schroeder would like to move this project up given the local community support and high value for fish.

Neil Werner - Small stream, not a high tier. Likely to have it funded somewhere else. Not all are fish passage barriers.

*Consensus agreement to leave entire list as it is, with conditions discussed above.

*Consensus agreement to reserve any unused funding (available either by project default or coming in under budget or alternative funding developed) for projects lower on the list (trickle-down theory).

Richard Brocksmith will work administratively to make that happen.

Meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.